Internal Revenue Service memorandum

GEBowden

date: 4 1990

subject:

to: District Counsel, Omaha MW: OMA

TL-N-7614-90 CC:TL:Br3 Bowden/Coe I.R.C. §§ 1311-1314 Mititation Provisions and Equitable Recoupment

from: Chief,	Branch 3,	Tax	Litigation	Division	CC:TL:Br3

Dkt. No.

Your memorandum of June 6, 1990 requested Tax Litigation Advice with respect to the above referenced case. In our view, your memorandum fully addresses all the relevant factors, and we concur with the conclusions you have reached.

ISSUES

- 1. Whether the mitigation statutes will allow petitioner to reopen closed years to take amortization deductions to which it would otherwise be entitled under the rationale of Colonial American Life Insurance Company v. Commissioner, 491 U.S. ____, 109 S.Ct. 2408 (1989).
- Whether equitable recoupment would allow the petitioner to set off the amortization deductions from the closed years against the deficiencies in the instant case, or allow the reopening of the closed years.

CONCLUSIONS

- 1. The mitigation provisions will allow the petitioner to reopen the closed years.
- Equitable recoupment will not be available to petitioner.

FACTS

At issue in the present case are deductions for reinsurance ceding commissions taken by petitioner in the and and It is the Service position that these commissions are amortizable rather than deductible. We lost this issue in the Tax Court and the Court of Appeals, but the case was remanded by the Supreme Court for reconsideration in light of the Colonial American opinion. In that opinion, the Supreme Court concluded that such commissions were amortizable over a sixty month period.

Because petitioner had currently deducted the full value of and amortization of the the commissions in

commissions produces deficiencies in those years. However, petitioner is entitled to deductions for the petitioner is entitled to deductions for the petitioner. The years the petitioner filed protective claims. The years and the petitioner filed protective claims. The years and the petitioner filed protective claims.

DISCUSSION

As to equitable recoupment, we agree with the conclusion reached in your memorandum: that it is not available to petitioner as a remedy. Because the Tax Court has long held that it does not have jurisdiction to consider equitable recoupment, the petitioner may not use it as a basis to claim an offset in the instant case. See, e.g., Estate of Schneider v. Commissioner, 93 T.C. 568 (1989). Nor may the petitioner use equitable recoupment as the basis for a separate cause of action. United States v.Dalm, ____ U.S. ____, 110 S.Ct. 1361 (1990). Further, it is well settled that the mitigation statutes preempt equitable recoupment. See, e.g., Gooding v. United States, 326 F.2d 988 (Ct. Cl. 1963). Thus, where mitigation applies, the courts will not allow equitable recoupment.

Accordingly, we agree with the conclusions reached in your memorandum. Mitigation is available to the petitioner to reopen and the but equitable recoupment is not. Please contact George Bowden at FTS 566-3407, if further information is required.

SARA M. COE